

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 remain in this application for further consideration. The claims have been amended as set forth above to further clarify the claims. No new matter has been added.

I. Rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,333,973 issued to Smith et al. (hereinafter "Smith") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0069291 published to Tindal et al (hereinafter "Tindal"). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection. Independent claim 1 includes the following combination of elements that are not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references:

accessing a registry of the mobile device, wherein the registry includes data that indicates a priority of each of the plurality of prioritized providers with respect to one another;

providing a plurality of prioritized providers on the mobile device in accordance with the priority indicated by the registry of the mobile device, wherein each provider is associated with a message type;

receiving a message on the mobile device;

routing, on the mobile device, the message to the plurality of prioritized providers on the mobile device, wherein the provider with the first highest priority receives the message first;

routing the message to the provider with the second highest priority when the provider with the first highest priority does not recognize the message type;
associating the message with at least one of the plurality of prioritized providers when the at least one of the plurality of prioritized providers recognizes the message type; and

informing an application of the mobile device and associated with the provider that the message is waiting without the application sending a query to receive an indication that the message is waiting.

The references do not teach or otherwise suggest the above combination of features. The Office Action admits that Smith fails to teach a plurality of providers and the routing to the plurality of providers. Therefore, Smith cannot possibly teach "accessing a registry of the mobile device, wherein the registry includes data that indicates a priority of each of the plurality

of prioritized providers with respect to one another," and "providing a plurality of prioritized providers on the mobile device in accordance with the priority indicated by the registry of the mobile device, wherein each provider is associated with a message type." Tindal does not remedy the lack of teaching in Smith. Tindal teaches prioritizing data. Depending on the priority of the data, the data is shifted to an appropriate network connective for routing. Accordingly, applicants assert that claim 1 is clearly allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 7 includes the following combination of features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references:

accessing a registry of the mobile device, wherein the registry includes data that indicates a priority of each of a plurality of prioritized providers with respect to one another;

providing a plurality of prioritized providers on the mobile device in accordance with the priority indicated by the registry of the mobile device, wherein each provider is associated with a message type;

receiving a message, on the mobile device, having a message type indicated by a character sequence in the message;

routing the message to a first prioritized provider on the mobile device from a list of prioritized providers on the mobile device;

associating the message with the first prioritized provider when the first prioritized provider recognizes the character sequence, wherein an application of the mobile device and associated with the first prioritized provider is informed that the message is waiting without the application sending a query to receive an indication that the message is waiting; and

routing the message to a second prioritized provider when the first prioritized provider does not recognize the character sequence.

The references do not teach or otherwise suggest the above combination of features. The Office Action admits that Smith fails to teach a plurality of providers and the routing to the plurality of providers. Therefore, Smith cannot possibly teach "accessing a registry of the mobile device, wherein the registry includes data that indicates a priority of each of the plurality of prioritized providers with respect to one another," and "providing a plurality of prioritized providers on the mobile device in accordance with the priority indicated by the registry of the mobile device, wherein each provider is associated with a message type." Tindal does not

remedy the lack of teaching in Smith. Tindal teaches prioritizing data. Depending on the priority of the data, the data is shifted to an appropriate network connective for routing. Accordingly, applicants assert that claim 7 is clearly allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 14 includes the following combination of features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references:

a processor and a computer-readable medium;

an operating environment stored on the computer-readable medium and executing on the processor;

a communication connection device operating under the control of the operating environment; and

a routing device operating under the control of the operating environment and operative to perform actions, including:

accessing a registry of the mobile device, wherein the registry includes data that indicates a priority of each of a plurality of prioritized providers with respect to one another;

providing priority to the plurality of prioritized providers in accordance with the priority indicated by the registry of the mobile device, wherein each provider is associated with a message type;

receiving a message on the mobile device having a provider indicator;

routing the message until at least one provider on the mobile device recognizes the provider indicator, wherein the message is routed according to a priority level of the provider, wherein the provider having the first highest level of priority receives the message first, and wherein the message is routed to a provider having a second highest level of priority when the provider having the first highest level of priority does not recognize the provider indicator;

associating the message with at least one provider when the at least one provider recognizes the provider indicator;

delivering the message to an application of the mobile device and associated with the at least one provider when the at least one provider recognizes the provider indicator, wherein the application is informed that the message is waiting without the application sending a query to receive an indication that the message is waiting.

The references do not teach or otherwise suggest the above combination of features. The Office Action admits that Smith fails to teach a plurality of providers and the routing to the plurality of providers. Therefore, Smith cannot possibly teach "accessing a registry of the mobile device, wherein the registry includes data that indicates a priority of each of the plurality of prioritized providers with respect to one another," and "providing priority to the plurality of prioritized providers in accordance with the priority indicated by the registry of the mobile device, wherein each provider is associated with a message type." Tindal does not remedy the lack of teaching in Smith. Tindal teaches prioritizing data. Depending on the priority of the data, the data is shifted to an appropriate network connective for routing. Accordingly, applicants assert that claim 14 is clearly allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 20 includes the following combination of features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references:

accessing a registry of the mobile device, wherein the registry includes data that indicates a priority of each of the plurality of prioritized providers with respect to one another;

providing a plurality of providers on the mobile device in accordance with the priority indicated by the registry of the mobile device, wherein each provider is associated with a message type and at least one application of the mobile device;

prioritizing the plurality of providers, wherein the plurality of providers are prioritized from a high priority to a low priority;

receiving at least one message including a provider character sequence;

routing the at least one message to the prioritized plurality of providers until one of the plurality of providers recognizes the provider character sequence, wherein the message is routed to each of the providers in order of priority;

indicating that the message is recognized;

associating the recognized message with the recognizing provider;

informing an application that the message is waiting without the application sending a query to receive an indication that the message is waiting;

requesting, by the application, delivery of the message;

associating the request with the recognizing provider;

formatting the message for the application; and
delivering the formatted message to the application.

The references do not teach or otherwise suggest the above combination of features. The Office Action admits that Smith fails to teach a plurality of providers and the routing to the plurality of providers. Therefore, Smith cannot possibly teach "accessing a registry of the mobile device, wherein the registry includes data that indicates a priority of each of the plurality of prioritized providers with respect to one another," and "providing a plurality of prioritized providers on the mobile device in accordance with the priority indicated by the registry of the mobile device, wherein each provider is associated with a message type." Tindal does not remedy the lack of teaching in Smith. Tindal teaches prioritizing data. Depending on the priority of the data, the data is shifted to an appropriate network connective for routing. Accordingly, applicants assert that claim 20 is clearly allowable over the cited references.

Regarding dependent claims 2-6, 8-13, and 15-19, those claims include features not taught or suggested by the cited references. Moreover, the dependent claims ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 7 and 14, respectively. As such, they are thought allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

II. Request for Reconsideration

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Ryan T. Grace

Registration No. 52,956

Direct Dial: 206.342.6258

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

